

REMARKS

With the foregoing amendment claims 23-34, 37-40, 42-47 and 49-56 are pending in the application. Claims 1-22, 35, 36, 41 and 48 are cancelled. Claims 23, 33, 34 and 40 are amended. And claims 53-56 are added. Claims 23, 37, 46, 49, 50, 52 and 53 are independent. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 37-40, 42-47 and 52 are allowed.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 27 is allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of claim 23 from which it depends. Claim 53 includes all of the features of claim 27 and claim 23. Accordingly, claim 53 is allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 23, 26, 33, 34, 41 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. With respect to claims 26 and 41, this rejection is moot as the claims have been cancelled.

Claims 23 and 50 have been amended to fix a typographical error. Applicants submit that this amendment obviates the 112 rejection, as the term "conductive jacket" now has proper antecedent basis.

Similarly the amendment to claim 33 and 34 also obviate the 112 rejection.

First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 23, 25-26, 29, 32 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Schumacher (U.S. 5,823,795). Applicants respectfully traverse.

With respect to claim 23, Applicants submit that Schumacher does not disclose all of the features of claim 23. For example, Schumacher, at the least, does not disclose, "a first set of conductive spring elements each in contact with a corresponding one exposed end of said two electrical conductors," as is recited in claim 1.

Schumacher indeed discloses a conductive element in contact with an exposed end of a signal carrying electrical conductor of a twinax cable. For example, in figure 2 of Schumacher, Schumacher discloses a conductive element (see element 52) in contact with a signal carrying electrical conductor (see element 44).

Importantly, however, the conductive element (e.g., element 52 or 50) disclosed in Schumacher is NOT a conductive spring element, and claim 23 requires a conductive spring element. Rather, elements 52 and 50 are merely "PCB signal contact pads." Schumacher, Col. 4, lines 20-25. A PCB signal contact pad is not a spring element. A spring element is an elastic device, such as, for example, a coil of wire or the like, that regains its original shape after being compressed or extended. This definition of spring element does not read on a "PCB signal contact pad." Thus, Schumacher does not disclose all of the features of claim 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

Like claim 1, claim 50 requires "a first set of conductive spring elements each in contact with a corresponding one exposed end of said two electrical conductors." Thus, claim 50 is patentable over Schumacher for at least the same reasons give above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, claim 50 requires "a latching device for latching onto a guide pin." The connector of Schumacher does not have such a latching device. Moreover, the Office Action

has not even alleged that Schumacher has such a latching device. For this additional reason, claim 50 is not anticipated by Schumacher.

With respect to claims 25, 29 and 32, these claims depend from claim 23 and, therefore, are not anticipated by Schumacher for at least the same reasons give above with respect to claim 23.

Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Kieninger (EP 1087466). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 49 is directed to a "compression mount electrical connector." Although this feature is found only in the preamble of claim 49, this feather is nevertheless a limitation of the claim because it breaths life and meaning into to the claim. In other words, claim 49, as properly construed, can not read on an electrical connector unless the electrical connector is a "compression mount electrical connector."

In this case, the connector disclosed in Kieninger is NOT a compression mount connector. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 49 be withdrawn.

First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious in view of Schumacher and alleged admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 24 depends from claim 23, and, therefore, is patentable over Schumacher for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Schumacher in view of Sturdivant (U.S. 5,552,752). Applicants respectfully traverse.

With respect to claim 28, the Office Action states, "Schumacher does not explicitly disclose the shielding members are conductive spring elements, and the conductive spring elements are conductive spring." Applicants agree with this statement. However, Applicants do not agree that Sturdivant teaches shielding members that are conductive spring elements, as is required by claim 28.

Sturdivant does indeed disclose a spring element. For example, element 28 shown in FIG. 1a appears to be a spring element. According to Sturdivant element 28 is a "compressable center conductor." Col. 3, line 40. "The center conductor [28] is a compressible mass of thin wire densely packed ... to form compressible, springy button contacts 36a and 36b." Col. 3, lines 16-20.

However, this spring element disclosed in Sturdivant is not a "shielding member," as is required by claim 28. The spring element disclosed in Sturdivant is for connecting a first signal carrying transmission line to a second signal carrying transmission line. See Col. 3, lines 21-25 ("These button contacts can then be employed to make electrical contact with conductor lines ..."). Accordingly, while Sturdivant discloses a spring element, Sturdivant does not disclose that the spring element is a "shielding member" as is required by claim 28. Therefore, because neither Schumacher nor Sturdivant teach or suggest a spring element that is a shielding member, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 28 be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 30, claim 30 requires a set of conductive springs, wherein each conductive spring is in physical contact with an exposed end of an electrical conductor of a twin-ax cable. Neither Schumacher nor Sturdivant teach or suggest this feature.

As discussed above, Sturdivant discloses a conductive spring. However, there is no motivation or suggestion to modify Schumacher to incorporate the conductive spring of Sturdivant. The Office Action claims there is such a motivation. Specifically, the Office Action states, "it would have been obvious ... to include the teaching of Sturdivant in the Schumacher invention in order to make a reusable solderless interconnection and thereby provide connection of high integrity and reliability."

The Office Action is wrong for two reasons. First, the Office Action does not explain how a reusable solderless connection provides a connection of higher integrity and reliability than a solder connection. In fact, the opposite is generally true. A solder connection provides greater reliability and integrity than a solderless.

Second, there can be no motivation to modify Schumacher to include conductive springs to contact the signal conductors because such a modification would require a complete re-design of the Schumacher connector. Schumacher discloses using a PCB pad to contact the signal conductor. But, one can not simply replace a PCB pad with a spring. The two just aren't interchangeable.

For at least the above reasons there is no motivation to combine Sturdivant with Schumacher. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 30 be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 31, the above remarks for claim 30 apply. Additionally, neither Schumacher nor Sturdivant teach

or suggest "at least one conductive spring element positioned between said exposed end and a conductive pad on a printed circuit board," as is required by claim 31. Further, the Office Action does not allege that Schumacher or Sturdivant teach or suggest this feature. Lastly, there is simply no logical reason to modify Schumacher to include a spring between the signal conductor (element 42 or 44) and the conductive pad (element 50 or 52) on the circuit board 14.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 31 be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 51, the above remarks for claim 30 apply.

With respect to claims 33 and 34, these claims depend from claim 23 and, therefore, are patentable over the art of record for at least the same reasons give above with respect to claim 23.


New Claims

New claims 53-56 have been added. Claim 53 corresponds to claim 27 rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims. Thus, claim 53 is allowable. Claims 54-56 depend from claim 53.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
<i>NAME AND REG. NUMBER</i>	Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276				
<i>SIGNATURE</i>		<i>DATE</i>	4/1/04		
<i>Address</i>	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
<i>City</i>	Washington	<i>State</i>	D.C.	<i>Zip Code</i>	20005
<i>Country</i>	U.S.A.	<i>Telephone</i>	202-783-6040	<i>Fax</i>	202-783-6031